

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 were presented for examination. The office action dated September 10, 2007 rejects claims 1-30. The office action also objects to the specification. This response amends claims 1, 23, and 26-30. Claims 1-30 remain pending in the application. Amendment to claim 11 is to correct an antecedent basis, and amendments to claims 27-30 are to make their preambles consistent with the preamble of the independent claim from which they depend.

Specification Objection

The Office Action objects to the specification because of an informality. In paragraph [00010], line 1 the word 'n' should be changed to -- an--. Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the informality and accordingly amends the specification to correct it.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-19, 23-25 and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fijolek (U.S. Patent No. 7,068,571). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because Fijolek does not disclose or suggest assigning to a managed resource a structured address that is a coded identity designation used to identify and distinguish the managed resource from other managed resources, as now set forth in the Applicant's invention.

As now set forth in representative independent claim 1, the Applicant's invention, in pertinent part, assigns a structured address to a managed resource. The assigned structured address is a coded identity designation used to identify and distinguish the managed resource from other managed

resources in the communications network. Each address segment of the assigned structured address conveys information about a property of the managed resource.

Fijolek teaches a DHCP message format. Granted, Fijolek's message format can be thought of as structured and as having segments that each conveys information. However, Fijolek's message format is used for purposes of generating DHCP messages. Messages are not the equivalent of the Applicant's claimed structured address. Unlike the Applicant's claimed structured address, messages are sent, not assigned, to a managed resource. To equate sending with assigning would be to distort the meanings of these words. Therefore, Fijolek does not disclose assigning a structured address to a managed resource, as set forth in the Applicant's claimed invention.

Notwithstanding, Applicant has amended the claims to distinguish more clearly the Applicant's structured address from Fijolek's structured message. As now set forth in representative claim 1, the structured address assigned to a managed resource is a coded identity designation used to identify and distinguish the managed resource from other managed resources. Thus, the Applicant's structured address is analogous to a name or an appellation by which a managed resource may be known. In contrast, Fijolek's DHCP messages are electronic communications that are sent to a resource; they are not designations of the identity of that resource – i.e., Fijolek's messages are not names assigned to the resource, coded or otherwise. Therefore, Fijolek neither anticipates nor suggests the Applicant's claimed invention. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Each other independent claim recites language similar to that of claim 1,

and therefore is patentable for at least the reasons provided in connection with claim 1. Each dependent claim depends directly or indirectly from one of the patentable independent claims, and incorporates all of its respective limitations and, therefore, is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least those reasons provided in connection with the independent claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejects claims 3, 26, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fijolek in view of Boreham (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,686), claim 8 as being unpatentable over Fijolek in view of Verteuil (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0219932), and claims 20-22 as being unpatentable over Fijolek in view of Chang (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0074468). Each of these dependent claims depends directly or indirectly from one of the patentable independent claims, and incorporates all of its respective limitations and, therefore, is patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least this reason. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and arguments made herein, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicant's representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-0932.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 10, 2008
Reg. No. 41,274

Tel. No.: (508) 303-0932
Fax No.: (508) 303-0005

/Michael A. Rodriguez/
Michael A. Rodriguez
Attorney for Applicant
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752